

Serial No.: 10/559,947

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this Patent Application, particularly in view of the above Amendment and the following remarks. No additional fee is required for this Amendment as the number of independent claims is less than three, and the total number of claims is not more than twenty.

Telephone Interview Summary

The undersigned thanks Examiner Walberg for the courtesy of the brief discussion on 11 August 2009. The Examiner's Interview Summary accurately reflects the discussion, and no issue on the merits was discussed.

Request for Further Telephone Interview

Applicants kindly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (847) 490-1400 to schedule a telephone interview, to discuss the new rejections and the merits of this Patent Application.

Amendment to the Claims

Claim 21 has been amended for clarity, with support for the changes found in at least the original language of Claim 21 and Fig. 2. Dependent claims have

Serial No.: 10/559,947

been amended to depend on Claim 21. No new matter has been added to the claims by this Amendment.

Claim Objections

The Amendment renders the objection to Claims 3, 14, 16 and 19 moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of Claims 3, 6-11, 14-19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima, JP 4-335557, in view of Nakazato et al., EP 0741269, and further in view of Cheon, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0008483, and Novotny et al., U.S. Patent 7,252,139, is respectfully traversed.

Nakajima is applied for teaching a cooling installation. Nakazato is applied for teaching feeding cold air both to a device and further in a double bottom. Neither Nakajima nor Nakazato, alone or in combination, provides or suggests Applicants' recited parallel heat exchangers in a housing, that are connected to a cooling feed/return connected to other cabinets, that include an individual pump that is connected in the feed line of each of the heat exchangers, and that include an expansion vessel additionally connected in the feed line of an uppermost one of the parallel heat exchangers.

Serial No.: 10/559,947

The Office Action applies Cheon for disclosing “an electronic cabinet cooling system including an individual pump (33) connected with the feed line of each of the heat exchangers (see Fig. 10).” The Office Action alleges it would have been obvious to use the individual pumps of Cheon in the feed line of the heat exchanger of Nakajima.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the combination and the reasoning in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully assert that the combination in the Office Action does not provide Applicants’ recited cooling installation with a plurality of air/water heat exchangers housed in a heat exchanger cabinet and operated in parallel within the interior. The combination also does not provide or suggest an individual pump connected with each of the heat exchangers.

Nakajima discloses a single heat exchanger 5 in unit cabinet 1. Nakazato also teaches a single air/water heat exchanger in air conditioner cabinet unit 11. Cheon likewise teaches a single air water heat exchanger 22 in cabinet 20 (Fig. 1). The Office Action notes Fig. 10 of Cheon, where a pump 33 is assigned to each electronic device 1 (Paragraphs [0057]-[0059]). Each electronic device 1 includes a liquid coolant circulation tubing 10, but the electronic devices 1 of Cheon are not, nor are equivalent to, Applicants’ recited plurality of air/water heat exchangers. The

Serial No.: 10/559,947

structure in Fig. 10 of Cheon appears more analogous to the external/remote switchgear cabinet structure recited in the preamble of Claim 21.

One skilled in the art would understand that the teaching of the combination of Cheon and Nakajima/Nakazato is not to use individual pumps connected to feed lines of heat exchangers as alleged by the Office Action, but actually to use pumps in the feed line of individual electronic devices remote from and connected to a single heat exchanger.

Also unlike Applicants' claimed invention, Cheon discloses using the pumps 33 outside of the heat exchanger unit 20.

Novotny is applied for an expansion valve, and does not provide the deficiencies discussed above.

As none of the prior art references discloses or suggest more than a single air/water heat exchanger in a heat exchanger cabinet, the combination cannot provide or suggest Applicants' recited cooling installation structure. As not all claim limitations are provided or suggested by the combination, the *prima facie* case of obviousness is rebutted and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.


Serial No.: 10/559,947

Conclusion

Applicants intend to be fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action. If the Examiner detects any issue which the Examiner believes Applicants have not addressed or resolved in this response, Applicants' undersigned attorney requests a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Applicants sincerely believe that this Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and, thus, respectfully requests early allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Swanson
Registration No. 48,498

Pauley Petersen & Erickson
2800 West Higgins Road
Suite 365
Hoffman Estates, Illinois 60169
(847) 490-1400
FAX (847) 490-1403